

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,605 10/31/2003		John P. Franz	200308604-1	9858
75	590 09/17/2004		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			EDWARDS, ANTHONY Q	
Intellectual Property P.O. Box 27240	perty Administration		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Fort Collins CO 90527 2400		2835		

DATE MAILED: 09/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		A:A:A:A:			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Commons	10/698,605	FRANZ ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Anthony Q. Edwards	2835			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONI	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 Oc	ctober 2003.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2003 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). Djected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 5-8 are objected to because of the following informalities: referring to claims 5 and 6, both of the claims should probably depend from claim 2, since the limitation "the pivotable member" was first recited in claim 2. Furthermore, since claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 6, these claims are also objected to for at least the same reasons. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 13 recites the limitation "the positionable member" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim; the Examiner is not able to determine the limitation based on independent claim 9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 9-12 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,454,080 to Fasig et al. (hereinafter "Fasig"). Referring to claim 9, Fasig teaches a

locking mechanism for coupling and uncoupling a removable component (60) coupleable to and from a computer device (12), comprising a leveraging member (54) configured to at least partially disengage a removable component (60) with respect to a computer device, an engaging member (68) selectively positionable in first (i.e., clamped) and second (i.e., unclamped) positions such that the engaging member (68) in the first position at least partially engages with the leveraging member (54) in the first position, and a pivotable (70) member coupled to the engaging member such that pivotal movement of the pivotable member actuates the engaging member along a longitudinal axis (i.e., clamps along a lengthwise axis) of the engaging member. See Figs. 3 and 5a and the corresponding specification.

Referring to claim 10, Fasig teaches a locking mechanism, wherein the pivotable member (70) is configured to transition at least one of the removable component (60) and computer devices between an operational configuration and a dormant configuration. See Fig. 7 and the corresponding specification.

Referring to claim 11. Fasig teaches a locking mechanism, wherein the pivotable member (70) is electrically coupled to an indicator (i.e., LED) configured to indicate visually the status of at least one of the computer device and removable component between the operational and dormant configurations. See col. 6, lines 40-45.

Referring to claim 12, Fasig teaches a locking mechanism, wherein the pivotable member (70) and the leveraging member (54) are coupled to the removable component (60). See Fig. 5a showing each member (54, 68 and 70, respectively) coupled to the removable device.

Referring to claim 23, Fasig teaches a method of selectively securing a removable component (60) to a computer device (12), comprising actuating a locking mechanism such that

the locking mechanism actuates an engaging member (68) through a pivotable member (70) configured to selectively position the removable component between secured of unsecured configurations with respect to the computer device. See col. 6, lines 46-67.

Referring to claim 24, Fasig teaches the method as claimed, wherein actuation comprises pivoting a pivotable member (70) coupled to the engaging member (60). See col. 6, lines 60-67.

Referring to claim 25, Fasig teaches the method as claimed, wherein actuation comprises translating the pivotal movement of the pivotal member (70) into lateral movement of the engaging member (68) along a longitudinal axis of the engaging member (i.e., clamping along a lengthwise axis of the engaging member).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 14-19, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fasig in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,200,146 to Sarkissian. Referring to claims 1 and 14, Fasig discloses a system comprising a computer device, a removable component (60) engageable and disengageable with the computer device, and a locking assembly or mechanism for coupling and uncoupling a removable component (60) coupleable to and from a computer device (12), comprising a first member (54) selectively positionable between secured and unsecured configurations of the removable component with respect to the computer device and for at least partially disengaging the removable component with respect to the computer device, (see Fig.

5a), and a second or engaging (68) positionable between first and second configurations (i.e., clamped and unclamped, respectively). Fasig does not teach the first configuration wherein the second member extends through the first member in the secured configuration to secure the first member. Sarkissian teaches a locking mechanism (Fig. 4) for coupling and uncoupling a removable component (68) coupleable to and from a computer device (not shown), comprising a pivotable member (110), a first member (75) and a second member having portion (108), wherein the second member (108) extends through the first member (75) to secure the first member in a secured configuration. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the second member of Fasig, to include a portion that extends through the first member, as taught by Sarkissian to reduce or prevent unwanted sliding of the computer component in the secured configuration.

Referring to claim 2, Fasig in view of Sarkissian discloses a locking mechanism comprising a pivotable member (70) configured to actuate the second member (68) selectively between the first and second configurations. See Fig. 4 of Sarkissian.

Referring to claims 3 and 22, Fasig in view of Sarkissian discloses a system and a locking assembly or mechanism, wherein the removable component (60) is a hot-pluggable device. See col. 3, lines 23-27 of Fasig.

Referring to claim 4, Fasig in view of Sarkissian discloses a locking mechanism, except for the first member (54) comprising a lever pivotably coupled to the removable component. Fasig does disclose a lever (53) to pivotally couple the removable component. It is well known; however, in the art of locking mechanisms for removable computer components to rearrange parts where needed (see *In re Japikse*, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950)). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the device of Fasig to include a lever on the first member thereof to lower and raise the first member where needed.

Referring to claim 5, as best understood by the Examiner, Fasig in view of Sarkissian discloses a locking mechanism, wherein the pivotable member (70) is a knob coupled to the removable component (60). See Fig. 3 of Fasig.

Referring to claim 6, as best understood by the Examiner, Fasig in view of Sarkissian discloses a locking mechanism, wherein the pivotable member (70) is configured to transition the removable component selectively between an operational configuration and a dormant configuration. See Fig. 7 and the corresponding specification.

Referring to claims 7 and 8, as best understood by the Examiner, Fasig in view of Sarkissian discloses a locking mechanism, wherein the locking mechanism is configured to set the removable component in the dormant configuration during a transition between the secured and unsecured configuration, and wherein the dormant configuration is an unpowered configuration and the operational configuration is a powered configuration, respectively (see Figs. 7, 8, and the corresponding specification).

Referring to claim 15, Fasig in view of Sarkissian discloses a system comprising a pivotable member (70) configured to actuate the engaging member (68) between first and second configurations, wherein the pivotal movement of the pivotable member actuates the engaging member along a longitudinal axis (i.e., clamps along a lengthwise axis) of the engaging member.

Referring to claims 16 and 17, Fasig in view of Sarkissian discloses a system, wherein the computer device comprises a server and personal computer (see Fig. 1 of Fasig), wherein the computer shown may be used as a stand alone computer or server for network.

Referring to claims 18 and 19, Fasig in view of Sarkissian discloses a system, wherein the removable component comprises a memory component, which includes a disk-drive.

Referring to claim 21, Fasig in view of Sarkissian discloses a system, wherein at least one of the first member and the engaging member is coupled to the removable component. See Fig. 5a of Fasig, which shows both the first member (54) and the engaging member (68) coupled to the removable component

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fasig in view of Sarkissian, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,728,099 to Tsang et al. Fasig, as modified, discloses the device as claimed, except for the removable component comprising a cooling device. Tsang et al. disclose a system having removable cooling components (see Figs. 3 and 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the device of Fasig to include removable cooling devices, as taught by Tsang et al., since selectively removable cooling units are easier to repair and/or replace as needed.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: U.S. Patent No. 6,310,777 to Knott and U.S. Patent No. 5,923,541 to Yasumi disclose connector devices for a removably component having a knob coupled to the removably component.

Application/Control Number: 10/698,605 Page 8

Art Unit: 2835

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Q. Edwards whose telephone number is 571-272-2042. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-3:00) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn D. Feild can be reached on 571-272-2800, ext. 35. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 14, 2004 age

LYNN FEILD SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800